



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,923	01/09/2006	Machiel Antonius Martinus Hendrix	NL030799	3809
24737 7590 05/24/2007 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			EXAMINER RILEY, SHAWN	
			ART UNIT 2838	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/24/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/563,923

Applicant(s)

HENDRIX ET AL.

Examiner

Shawn Riley

Art Unit

2838

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 January 2007 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date jan 06.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawing(s) is(are) objected to because they fail to label (figure(s) 3, 4, 7, and 10) what the element boxes 10₁₋₃, signal 15₁₋₃, signal 14₁, 20, 30, signal 34, 67, 60, (input signal into 21 and output signal at 34), S_M, S_{C.in}, 70, and 50 are. Without some indication as to the content of the boxes (or preferably ansi symbols of the actual elements) it is not clear as to what the elements are and they are not explanatory to a reader as a quick method of determining the general background of the invention.

See MPEP 608.02 and 37 CFR 1.84 (o) -- **Legends**

Suitable descriptive legends may be used, or may be required by the Examiner, where necessary for understanding of the drawing, subject to approval by the Office. They should contain as few words as possible.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Disclosure lacks headings such as Technical Background, Summary of the Invention, Brief Description of the Drawings, Detailed Description, etc. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2838

3. Applicant(s) is(are) reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits (**Low power modules are relatively easily manufacturable in high volume**) or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Correction is required.

4. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as “**comprises**”, “means”, and “said,” should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6, 18, 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being fully anticipated by Prager (U.S. Patent 5,875,104). Prager shows, (in, e.g., the(ir) figures 1 and 5 and corresponding

Art Unit: 2838

disclosure at column 8 lines 33-40 from column 9 line 66 up to column 10 line 5 and figures 1 and 5)

As described in the abstract, Prager shows dc-dc converters switched mode power supply assembly comprising a plurality of at least two switched mode power supply modules (101-103/200) coupled to each other in a ring-configuration (through 200 also see figure 5); each power supply module (10.sub.i) comprising synchronisation control means for generating a synchronisation control signal for a next neighbouring module (10.sub.i+1) and for receiving a synchronisation control signal from a previous neighbouring module (10.sub.i-1) in order to ensure interleaved operation of all modules having the same units used to supply lamps/leds.

Note that applicants are presumed to have knowledge of their art and therefore may be expected to recognize, e.g., what a ring circuit would be. Further, differences should be pointed out not between disclosure and the prior art but what is claimed and the prior art. The rejection of the instant invention did not rely on the disclosure but the claims in light of the disclosure. That is, the rejection is based heavily on what the claims state and not solely on what the disclosure discloses. As recited, the claims are anticipated by the disclosure of the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

4. Claims 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Prager (U.S. Patent) in view of Tanaka et al. (US patent 6,157,182). The Prager reference discloses the limitations of the invention as claimed as described above. However, Prager does not show current control means. Tanaka et al shows current control means (including hysteresis) in columns 5 and 6 as well as discussion in the abstract. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to utilize current control means into the circuit of Prager for the reason of controlling the output value of the current to the load to provide a safe level that would allow the load to function optimally.

5. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Prager (U.S. Patent) in view of Canter et al. (US patent 5,477,132). The Prager reference discloses the limitations of the invention as claimed as described above. However, Prager does not show dc/ac inverter modules or a solar assembly. Canter et al. show dc/ac inverter modules or a solar assembly in columns 9 lines 1-5. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to utilize show dc/ac inverter modules or a solar assembly into the circuit of Prager for the reason of providing output power from a source of emf for the reason of using available power supplies without relying on an external physical connection to a man made generated power source.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. No claims are allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

Any inquiry from other than the applicant/attorney of record concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to the Patent Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 1.866.217.9197. Any inquiry from a member of the press concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner or the application should be directed to the Office of Public Affairs at 703.305.8341. Any inquiry from the applicant or an attorney of record concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Examiner Riley whose telephone number is 571.272.2083. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30-6:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time. The Examiner's Supervisor is Karl Easthom who can be reached at 571.272.1989. Any inquiry about a case's location, retrieval of a case, or receipt of an amendment into a case or information regarding sent correspondence to a case **should be directed to 2800's Customer Service Center** at 571.272.2815. Any papers to be sent by fax MUST BE sent to fax number **571-273-8300**. Any inquiry of a general nature of this application should be **directed to the Group receptionist** whose telephone number is 571.272.2800. Status information of cases may be found at <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> wherein unpublished application information is found through private PAIR and published application information is found through public PAIR. Further help on using the PAIR system is available at 1.866.217.9197 (Electronic Business Center).

May 07

/Shawn Riley/
Primary Examiner A.U. 2838